

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: **Ramachandran** §  
Serial No.: **10/728,160** § Group Art Unit: **2175**  
Filed: **December 4, 2003** § Examiner: **Lee, Jinhee J.**  
For: **Method and Apparatus for** § Confirmation No.: **6788**  
**Maintaining Browser Navigation** §  
**Relationships and for Choosing a** §  
**Browser Window for New Documents**

**35525**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.37)**

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on October 15, 2008.

A fee of \$540.00 is required for filing an Appeal Brief. Please charge this fee to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No additional fees are believed to be necessary. If, however, any additional fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

### **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest in this appeal is the following party: International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, New York.

### **RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

This appeal has no related proceedings or interferences.

## **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

### **A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION**

The claims in the application are: 1 - 21

### **B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION**

Claims canceled: None

Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None

Claims pending: 1 - 21

Claims allowed: None

Claims rejected: 1 - 21

Claims objected to: None

### **C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

The claims on appeal are: 1 - 21

## **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

A Response to Final Office Action, without claim amendment, was filed by Appellants on September 12, 2008. In an Advisory Action dated October 10, 2008, the Examiner stated the arguments were not persuasive and the final rejection of all pending claims was sustained.

## **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

When using a Web-based browser with the Internet to access information/data, oftentimes a user may open multiple browser windows. These browser windows contain different web pages or documents. The user may desire these windows to remain open based on reading or research being performed by the user. For example, if a user is reading a tutorial, the user may wish to have the table of contents in one browser window with other documents opened up in other browser windows. If a user selects a link or hyperlink on a Web page, the browser may open a new window to open the new page. Alternatively, the new page may be opened in the current window. Also, the document may be opened in one of the already opened windows. However, the user is unable to control which window is selected to open the document if the browser opens the document in another browser window that is already opened without dragging the mouse pointer to another window. If the user is using multiple browser windows, the user may want to overwrite one particular window, rather than the one selected by the browser program. The present claims are directed to an improved method, apparatus, and computer instructions for maintaining browser navigation relationships and choosing a browser window for new Web pages or documents.

### **A. CLAIM 1 - INDEPENDENT**

The subject matter of claim 1 is directed to a method in a data processing system for managing display of a new document (Specification page 12, lines 12-16; Figure 5). In response to receiving a user input indicating that the new document is to be displayed (Specification page 13, lines 11-15; page 15, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 500), a list of currently active browser windows (Figure 4B, element 426) *including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows* is displayed (Specification page 13, lines 15-20 and lines 25-30; page 15, line 29 – page 16, line 2; Figure 4B, elements 428, 430 and 432; Figure 5, step 518). In response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows (Specification page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 7; page 16, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 520), a document displayed in the browser window with the new document is replaced (Specification page 14, lines 7-10; page 16, lines 4-5; Figure 5, step 522).

## **B. CLAIM 9 - INDEPENDENT**

The subject matter of claim 9 is directed to a data processing system for managing display of a new document on a video display of the data processing system (Specification page 12, lines 12-16; Figure 5). The data processing system comprises displaying means, responsive to receiving a user input indicating that the new document is to be displayed (Specification page 13, lines 11-15; page 15, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 500), for displaying on the video display of the data processing system a list of currently active browser windows (Figure 4B, element 426) *including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows* (Specification page 13, lines 15-20 and lines 25-30; page 15, line 29 – page 16, line 2; Figure 4B, elements 428, 430 and 432; Figure 5, step 518). The data processing system also comprises replacing means, responsive to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows (Specification page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 7; page 16, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 520), for replacing a document displayed in the browser window with the new document (Specification page 14, lines 7-10; page 16, lines 4-5; Figure 5, step 522).

## **C. CLAIM 15 - INDEPENDENT**

The subject matter of claim 15 is directed to a computer program product encoded in a computer readable, recordable-type medium and operable in a data processing system for managing display of a new document (Specification page 12, lines 12-16; page 16, line 22 – page 17, line 10; Figure 5, all steps). The computer program product comprises first instructions, responsive to receiving a user input indicating that the new document is to be displayed (Specification page 13, lines 11-15; page 15, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 500), for displaying a list of currently active browser windows (Figure 4B, element 426) *including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows* (Specification page 13, lines 15-20 and lines 25-30; page 15, line 29 – page 16, line 2; Figure 4B, elements 428, 430 and 432; Figure 5, step 518). The computer program product comprises second instructions, responsive to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows (Specification page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 7; page 16, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 520), for replacing a document displayed in the browser window with the new document (Specification page 14, lines 7-10; page 16, lines 4-5; Figure 5, step 522).

**D. CLAIM 21 - INDEPENDENT**

The subject matter of claim 21 is directed to a data processing system (Specification page 7, lines 27-30; Figure 2, element 200). The data processing system comprises a bus system and a memory connected to the bus system (Specification page 8, lines 2-7; Figure 2, elements 204 and 206). The data processing system comprises a processing unit connected to the bus system (Specification page 8, lines 8-9; Figure 2, element 202). The processing unit executes a set of instructions in the memory to receive a user input indicating that a new document is to be displayed (Specification page 13, lines 11-15; page 15, lines 3-4; Figure 5, step 500), wherein a list of browser windows is displayed (Figure 4B, element 426) *including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows* (Specification page 13, lines 15-20 and lines 25-30; page 15, line 29 – page 16, line 2; Figure 4B, elements 428, 430 and 432; Figure 5, step 518); and replace a document displayed in the browser window with the new document (Specification page 14, lines 7-10; Figure 5, step 522) in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of browser windows (Specification page 13, line 25 – page 14, line 7; page 16, lines 3-4; page 16, lines 4-5; Figure 5, step 520).



## **GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

The grounds of rejection to review on appeal are as follows:

### **A. GROUND OF REJECTION 1**

Whether Claims 1 – 20 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement;

### **B. GROUND OF REJECTION 2**

Whether Claims 1 – 20 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention;

### **C. GROUND OF REJECTION 3**

Whether Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-20 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Busis et al. (2002/0085025), hereinafter “Busis”;

### **D. GROUND OF REJECTION 4**

Whether Claim 21 was properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Saylor et al. (2002/0186238), hereinafter “Saylor”; and

### **E. GROUND OF REJECTION 5**

Whether Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 16 and 18 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable in view of Saylor et al. (2002/0186238), hereinafter “Saylor”.

## ARGUMENT

### A. GROUND OF REJECTION 1 (Claims 1-20)

Claims 1 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

#### 1. *Claims 1-20*

The Examiner states that the limitation “a new document is to be displayed, a list of currently active browser windows including an indication of a presently displayed document” is new matter not previously disclosed since Appellant’s specification indicates that a list of currently active browser windows display when “select” is selected by the user, not “new” for example. Appellants urge that this claimed feature is described in the Specification at page 5, lines 5-8, page 13, lines 11-30, and originally filed Claim 1 (which is also a part of the Specification as originally filed). As described in the Specification, in the preferred embodiment the list is displayed in response to a user right-clicking on a URL to be opened, followed by the user selecting a given menu option (in the preferred embodiment, such menu option is labeled ‘select’ but this particular choice of a word is not critical to the invention, and could arbitrarily be other command notations/labels such as ‘specify window’ or ‘window specify’ or ‘window select’ or ‘existing’ or any of a numerous – and virtually an unlimited number of - ways to give a user a menu item for selection, as such choice of a particular title for the menu item is not critical to the present invention). Importantly, the Examiner appears to equate ‘new document’ in the claim with the ‘new’ in the menu list 418. However, **the ‘new’ in the menu list 418 refers to a new *window*, and not a new *document***, in the preferred embodiment (Specification page 13, lines 23-25).

To summarize, the ‘user input’ recited in Claim 1 is, in the preferred embodiment, a right mouse click over a URL followed by the user selecting a particular menu item (in this case, ‘select’ 424 of Figure 4B). The ‘new’ element 422 of Figure 4B represents a user desiring a new *window*, and not the new *document* recited in the claims, in the preferred embodiment.

It is also noteworthy that Claim 1 does not specify exactly what the user selects in performing the ‘user input’ – nor is there any legal requirement to specify exactly what the user

selects in the claim - as per Claim 1 the user input is generalized to be *any* form of user input that indicates that a new document is to be displayed.

The Examiner also opines, in the advisory action dated 10/10/2008 that they cannot find ‘a list of currently active browser windows’ in the original disclosure. Appellants direct the Examiner’s attention to page 13, lines 26-30 of the Specification, where it states:

“The sub-menu contains a **list of browser windows currently active** in display 400”

This is also depicted in Figure 4B, element 426, which is a list of currently active browser windows 412, 414 and 416 of this same Figure 4B. Thus, the Specification does adequately describe and depict this claimed feature.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is clearly erroneous.

## **B. GROUND OF REJECTION 2 (Claims 1-20)**

Claims 1 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention.

### **1. Claims 1-20**

The Examiner states the claims are confusing, because the list of browser windows is displayed when ‘select’ is selected, and not when ‘new’ is selected. The Examiner is correct, as per the preferred embodiment the list of browser windows is displayed when ‘select’ is selected. The ‘new’ is selected when a new *window* is desired to be opened. However, the claims merely state that ‘user input’ results in such displaying of the browser window list (in particular, the list display occurs is ‘in response to receiving user input’), and does not specify exactly ‘what’ the user selects when performing such ‘user input’ – and the ‘what’ that the user selects is described in the preferred embodiment at Specification at page 13, lines 11-30 to be a right mouse click followed by ‘select’, as previously described above in response to the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection.

Thus, it is urged that the Examiner’s confusion regarding a user selecting ‘new’ is not with respect to selecting a new *document*, but instead is directed to selecting a new *window* in the

preferred embodiment, as clearly described in the Specification – and the claims do not claim otherwise.

In the advisory action dated 10/10/2008, the Examiner impermissibly asserts a new reason/ground for rejecting Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as the Examiner now newly complains about what is meant by an ‘active’ window.<sup>1</sup> As this is a newly raised issue being made after the claims have been finally rejected, Appellant has not been afforded a proper opportunity to respond, either via argument or amendment, thus denying Appellant proper due process in the present rejection of such claims.

Appellant in any event asserts that an ‘active’ window is a common term known to those of ordinary skill in the art, and no special meaning is being asserted to such term in the present application. The Specification clearly states “Currently, most browser programs will open a new document in the *last active* browser window” (Specification page 12, lines 9-12). This sentence is evidence of at least two things: (1) this statement describes background art (“Currently, most browser programs”) and therefore proves that an ‘active’ window is not given any special meaning in the present application, but instead is being used in its normal meaning commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art (and thus use of such terminology is not vague or indefinite), and (2) there are multiple active windows (“last active browser window”), since the use of ‘last’ infers there can be more than one active browser window.<sup>2</sup>

The Specification also describes multiple active browser windows at page 13, lines 26-30 and depicts multiple active browser windows at elements 412, 414 and 416 of Figure 4B

The fact that browsers can have multiple active browser windows is also shown in the attached Evidence Exhibit I, where there are two active windows described, one for ‘the tutorial’ and another for ‘browsing elsewhere on the web’ (again, Appellant was denied proper due process

---

<sup>1</sup> 37 CFR 1.113(b): **In making such final rejection, the examiner shall repeat or state all grounds of rejection** then considered applicable to the claims in the application, clearly stating the reasons in support thereof.

<sup>2</sup> The next sentence regarding ‘active browser window’, when read in proper context with the preceding sentence, is clearly directed to the ‘last active’ browser window, and does not supercede the previous sentence that there are multiple active browser windows provided by current browser programs.

in this chameleon 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and therefore can only now present such rebuttal evidence).

Appellant traverses the rejection of Claims 2-20 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is clearly erroneous.

### **C. GROUND OF REJECTION 3 (Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-20)**

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Busis et al. (2002/0085025), hereinafter “Busis”.

#### **1. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19-20**

With respect to Claim 1, such claim recites “replacing, in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows, a document displayed in the browser window with the new document”. As can be seen, per these features of Claim 1, a document that is displayed in a browser window *is replaced* with the new document in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows.

In rejecting this aspect of Claim 1, the Examiner cites Busis’ teaching at paragraph 0046 and Figure 4 as teaching such claimed feature, since such passage teaches ‘opening a new window, selected browser window is opened’. Appellant urges that such ‘window opening’ does not teach *document replacement* in an ‘opened window’ (that occurs in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows) – instead Busis’ Figure 4 is directed to a technique for *adding information to a user’s list* (paragraph [0045], lines 1-2), such as a URL of a web page that is open on a client’s device (paragraph [0045], lines 7-10). The ‘window opening’ that the Examiner cites as teaching the ‘replacing’ step of Claim 1 is not directed to any type of document replacement in a window, as claimed, but instead is directed to opening a new browser window for the user such that the user can search the internet (paragraph [0046], lines 8-12). This cited passage also describes another situation where a new window is opened, such that a listing of the URLs for all open windows is displayed in this newly opened window. Importantly, because this is a *newly opened* window, **there is**

**nothing being ‘replaced’** – such as replacing a displayed document with a new document, as claimed – as the window is newly opened and thus has nothing displayed in it prior to it being newly opened.

Thus, the Examiner’s assertion that Busis’ description of ‘opening a new window’ is equivalent to the claimed step of replacing a document displayed in a browser window with the new document is clearly erroneous, as such ‘window opening’ of a new window does not have any document displayed in it that is replaced with a new document in response to a user selection of a browser window from a list of currently active browser windows. **Instead, and importantly, Busis describes that user selection of a browser window from a list of currently active browser windows results in such selected URL being copied to the user’s list window 80** (paragraph [0046], lines 27-30). In contrast, per the features of Claim 1, *a document that is displayed in the browser window that the user selects* (from a list of currently active browser windows) is *replaced with a new document*.<sup>3</sup> The cited reference does not teach such document replacement in response to a user selection from a list of currently active browser windows, but instead describes that *the selected URL is copied to a list*. Therefore, as every element recited in Claim 1 is not identically shown in a single reference, it is urged that Claim 1 has been erroneously rejected under 35 USC 102.<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is clearly erroneous.

---

<sup>3</sup> During examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 367 F.3d 1359, 1369, 70 USPQ2d 1827, 1834 (Fed. Cir. 2004). This means that the words of the claim must be given their **plain meaning** unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (discussed below); *Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 1371, 1372, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (Ordinary, simple English words whose meaning is clear and unquestionable, absent any indication that their use in a particular context changes their meaning, are **construed to mean exactly what they say**. Thus, "heating the resulting batter-coated dough to a temperature in the range of about 400°F to 850°F" required heating the dough, rather than the air inside an oven, to the specified temperature.) MPEP 2111.01(I) (emphasis added by Appellants). The Examiner is not interpreting the claim terms in accordance with their normal, plain meaning.

<sup>4</sup> For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

**D. GROUND OF REJECTION 4 (Claim 21)**

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Saylor et al. (2002/0186238), hereinafter “Saylor”.

**1. Claim 21**

Claim 21 recites “a list of browser windows is displayed including *an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows*” (emphasis added). This is substantially different from the teachings of the cited reference. The Examiner states that the display of an indication of a presently displayed document in each browser window is described by Saylor at paragraphs 0152 and 0177. Appellant urges error in such assertion. For example, Saylor describes at paragraphs 0152:

“[0152] The "File" dropdown menu 518 includes dropdown items 519 for "New", "Open", "Delete", "Connect to server", "New window", "Recent list", and "Exit". "New" allows user 23 to select logical hierarchy 30 to open in a new display window 50, while "Open" allows the same selection but uses an existing display window 50. "Delete" allows the user to close such display window 50. "Connect to server" opens a login dialog (not shown) so that user 23 may present credentials to web server 60. "New window" opens a redundant version of the current display window 50. "Recent list" is a flexible list of several dropdown items 519, each dropdown item 519 corresponding to a recently used logical hierarchy 30. Menu separators 521 can bracket the "Recent list". "Exit" starts a process to close client application 22.”

As can be seen by Saylor’s Figure 6B, a display window 50 is displayed. There is nothing shown/displayed in this display window 50 that indicates a *presently displayed document in each respective browser window* of currently active browser windows. Instead, menus of *commands* are depicted by Saylor. Thus, this cited passage does not teach the displaying step recited in Claim 1, as this cited passage does not teach displaying *an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window for multiple browser windows*.

Nor does the Sylor cited passage at paragraph [0177] overcome this ‘displaying’ step teaching deficiency. There, Sylor states:

“[0177] Main UI class 67 presents display window 50 that is the first interactive window presented by client application 22 at startup. When user 23 chooses dropdown item 519 (shown in FIG. 6B) such "New" or "Open" that opens logical hierarchy 30 for display, an instance of Main UI class 67 manages the displaying. As shown in FIG. 7B, Main UI class 67 launches objects including synch browser manager 68, viewer model 69, and viewer 64.”

This passage states that in response to a user choosing a ‘New’ or ‘Open’ command, a logical hierarchy 30 is open for display, and a synch browser manager, viewer model and viewer are launched. The ‘opening of a logical hierarchy for display’ does not teach the claimed step of displaying an indication of *a presently displayed document in each respective browser window for multiple browser windows*, as expressly recited in Claim 21. Instead, such opening of a logical hierarchy is described as being a flexible structure for collecting resource profiles and their relevant dependency relationships under one or more conceptual frameworks (Sylor paragraph [0084]).

In the advisory action dated 10/10/08, the Examiner appears to acknowledge that Sylor does not teach displaying an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window for multiple, currently active browser windows, as the Examiner states that the ‘list’ and the ‘indicators’ are the same thing. Appellant urges clear error, as the claim recites two distinct elements, and therefore they are not the same thing. The claim clearly recites both (1) ‘a list of currently active browser windows’ and (2) ‘an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows’. The fact that one (‘indication’) is a sub-set of another (‘list’) does not magically merge them into being the same thing. For example, an automobile may include an electric motor, but a teaching of an automobile does not teach an automobile that includes an electric motor. A birthday cake may include chocolate frosting, but a teaching of a birthday cake does not teach a birthday cake that includes chocolate frosting. Other countless examples could also be provided. Figure 4B clearly shows both a ‘list’ at element 426 and ‘indicators’ at elements 428, 430 and 432. Thus,



the Examiner's position that these two distinctly claimed elements 'are the same thing' is clearly erroneous.

Thus, as every element recited in Claim 21 is not identically shown in a single reference - and in particular there is no teaching of displaying an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window for multiple, currently active browser windows - it is urged that Claim 21 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Therefore, the rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is clearly erroneous.

**E. GROUND OF REJECTION 5 (Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 16 and 18)**

Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable in view of Saylor et al. (2002/0186238), hereinafter "Saylor".

**1. Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 16 and 18**

Appellant urges error in the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 16 and 18 for reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 10, 12, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is clearly erroneous.

**F. CONCLUSION**

As shown above, the Examiner has failed to state valid rejections against any of the claims. Therefore, Appellant requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the rejections. Additionally, Appellant requests that the Board direct the Examiner to allow the claims.

Date: December 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777

## **CLAIMS APPENDIX**

The text of the claims involved in the appeal is as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system for managing display of a new document, the method comprising data processing system implemented steps of:  
  
displaying, in response to receiving a user input indicating that the new document is to be displayed, a list of currently active browser windows including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows; and  
  
replacing, in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows, a document displayed in the browser window with the new document.
2. The method of claim 1 further comprising:  
  
promoting the browser window to a top of a window hierarchy.
3. The method of claim 1, wherein the indication is a document name from a title bar.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein the indication is a thumbnail of the document.
5. The method of claim 1, wherein the list of currently active browser windows, including the indication of the presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows, is displayed in a pop-up menu.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the receiving step and the replacing step are performed by a Web browser.
7. The method of claim 1, wherein the new document is selected from one of a Web page, an image, or a spreadsheet.
8. The method of claim 1, wherein the user input is received in a currently active browser window.
9. A data processing system for managing display of a new document on a video display of the data processing system, the data processing system comprising:
  - the video display;
  - displaying means, responsive to receiving a user input indicating that the new document is to be displayed, for displaying on the video display of the data processing system a list of currently active browser windows including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows; and
  - replacing means, responsive to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows, for replacing a document displayed in the browser window with the new document.
10. The data processing system of claim 9 further comprising:
  - promoting means for promoting the browser window to a top of a window hierarchy.

11. The data processing system of claim 9, wherein the indication is a document name from a title bar.

12. The data processing system of claim 9, wherein the indication is a thumbnail of the document.

13. The data processing system of claim 9, wherein the list of currently active browser windows, including the indication of the presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows, is displayed in a pop-up menu.

14. The data processing system of claim 9, wherein the receiving means and the replacing means are performed by a Web browser.

15. A computer program product encoded in a computer readable, recordable-type medium and operable in a data processing system for managing display of a new document, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions, responsive to receiving a user input indicating that the new document is to be displayed, for displaying a list of currently active browser windows including an indication of a presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of currently active browser windows; and

second instructions, responsive to a user selection of a browser window from the list of currently active browser windows, for replacing a document displayed in the browser window with the new document.

16. The computer program product of claim 15 further comprising:  
third instructions for promoting the browser window to a top of a window hierarchy.
17. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the indication is a document name from a title bar.
18. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the indication is a thumbnail of the document.
19. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the list of currently active browser windows, including the indication of the presently displayed document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows, is displayed in a pop-up menu.
20. The computer program product of claim 15, wherein the first instructions and the second instructions are performed by a Web browser.
21. A data processing system comprising:  
a bus system;  
a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and  
a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to receive a user input indicating that a new document is to be displayed, wherein a list of browser windows is displayed including an indication of a presently displayed

document in each respective browser window in the list of browser windows; and replace a document displayed in the browser window with the new document in response to a user selection of a browser window from the list of browser windows.

## EVIDENCE APPENDIX

# Using Multiple Browser Windows

Using these tutorials and viewing other web pages at the same time can be a breeze if you use two browser windows at the same time. It is like having two books open on your desk so that you can refer to either one. Follow the directions below:

### 1. Opening a New Browser Window

#### o **Technique 1**

From the "File" menu of your browser, select:

Netscape 3.X	"New Web Browser"
Netscape 4.X	"New", "Navigator Window"
Internet Explorer	"File", "New Window"

#### o **Technique 2**

Right click on a hypertext link for PC's (hold down on the mouse button for Macs) and you'll get a pop-up menu that will allow you to open this link in a New Window! (Internet Explorer has the same feature with slightly different wording).

At this point, you will have two active browser windows, one for the tutorial and one for browsing elsewhere on the web.

### 2. Now that you have two windows open, cascade the two browser windows so that you can see them both at the same time (this is more for you to visualize what is happening; you can maximize the screens once you understand the concept:

Windows	<p>Click on the resizing button in upper right hand corner of each browser window (the resizing button is the one that looks like two squares stacked on one another). This will allow you to see both windows. You can align them however you want by clicking and dragging the title bar. You can go back and forth between the two windows by using any of the following techniques:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o use the Alt-Tab function</li><li>o while the windows are cascaded, click on the one you want to make active (bring to the front)</li><li>o click on the program button in the taskbar at the bottom of the screen to make a window active (Windows 95)</li></ul>
---------	--

Mac	Resize the windows using the resizing function in the lower right hand corner. When you put your cursor on the lower right hand corner, it will turn to a double-sided arrow. Move this diagonally until you can see both windows. You can align the windows however you want by clicking and dragging the title bar. Then you can click on whichever window you want to make active (bring to the front).
-----	--

Use your browser's **Back** button to return to your previous page.

Source:

[http://scilnet.fortlewis.edu/edtech/mult\\_browsers.htm](http://scilnet.fortlewis.edu/edtech/mult_browsers.htm)



## **RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

This appeal has no related proceedings.